

Dated: February 14, 1999.

**Carrington Williams,**

*Chairman, Shenandoah Valley Battlefields  
National Historic District Commission.*

February 12, 1999.

**Leonard C. Emerson,**

*Assistant Regional Director, Human  
Resources, Northeast Region, National Park  
Service.*

[FR Doc. 99-4122 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, DOI.

**ACTION:** Announcement of Subsistence Resource Commission meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Superintendent of Aniakchak National Monument and the Chairperson of the Subsistence Resource Commission for Aniakchak National Monument announce a forthcoming meeting of the Aniakchak National Monument Subsistence Resource Commission. The following agenda items will be discussed:

- (1) Call to order. (Chairman)
- (2) SRC Roll call; confirmation of quorum. (Chairman)
- (3) Welcome and introductions. (Public, agency staff, others)
- (4) Review and adopt agenda. (SRC)
- (5) Review and adopt minutes from the October 1998 meeting.
- (6) Review commission's role and purpose.
- (7) Status of commission membership.
- (8) Public and agency comments.
- (9) Old business:
  - a. 1998 NPS/SRC Chairs Workshop Report.
  - b. Status of Aniakchak National Preserve hunting guide prospectus.
  - c. Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve Wildlife Report.
  - d. Review 1998 NPS/Secretary's response to final subsistence hunting program recommendations.
  - e. Implementation of approved hunting program recommendations.
  - f. Status of draft subsistence hunting program recommendations.
    - (1) 97-1: Establish a one-year residency requirement for the resident zone communities.
    - (2) 97-2: Establish a special registration permit requirement for non-subsistence (sport) hunting, trapping, and fishing activities within the Aniakchak National Preserve.
    - (3) Designate Ivanoff Bay and Perryville as resident zone communities.
    - (10) New business:
      - a. Federal Subsistence Program update.

(1) Bristol Bay Regional Council report.

(2) Review Unit 9E proposals/special actions.

(3) Federal Subsistence Fisheries update.

b. ORV C&T Team Progress Report (Coordinator).

c. Draft Aniakchak Subsistence Management Plan.

(11) Public and agency comments.

(12) SRC work session (draft proposals, letters, and recommendations).

(13) Set time and place of next SRC meeting.

(14) Adjournment.

**DATES:** The meeting will begin at 8 a.m. on Tuesday, March 2, 1999, and conclude at approximately 7 p.m. The meeting will reconvene at 8 a.m. on Wednesday, March 3, 1999, and adjourn approximately 1 p.m.

**LOCATION:** The meeting location is: Community Subsistence Building, Chignik Lake, Alaska.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Deb Liggett, Acting Superintendent, or Donald Mile, Resource Specialist, Aniakchak National Monument, P.O. Box 7, King Salmon, Alaska 99613. Phone (907) 246-3305.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Subsistence Resource Commissions are authorized under Title VIII, Section 808, of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Pub. L. 96-487, and operate in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committees Act.

**Robert D. Barbee,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-4077 Filed 2-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

#### Tracy Fish Facility Improvement Program, New Tracy Fish Facility, Central Valley Project, California

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare environmental documents (environmental assessment and initial study or environmental impact statement and environmental impact report) and notice of public meetings.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and Public Resources Code, Sections 21000-21178.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Bureau of

Reclamation (Reclamation), the lead Federal agency, and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), the lead State agency, propose to prepare environmental documents for the purpose of constructing and testing new fish screens and salvage facilities associated with a new Tracy Fish Facility (TFF), Central Valley Project, California. The environmental documents will evaluate the effects of the development and testing of a new TFF at or near the existing Tracy Fish Collection Facility.

A new TFF will provide timely information on critical issues related to new fish protection facilities at the State of California's diversion at Clifton Court Forebay (CCF), Tracy, and the North Delta. The project intent is to build, operate, and evaluate a best available technology facility that will screen a portion of Tracy flows until a decision is made on screening the full Tracy pumping capacity. The new facilities would screen about 2,500 cfs at an approach velocity of 0.2 fps and would meet other appropriate fish agency criteria. The facility would have the structural and operational flexibility to optimize screening operations for multiple species in the challenging south Delta environment. The old Tracy Fish Collection Facility would be improved and remain in place to screen the remainder of the flow, until a decision is made to screen the remainder of the Tracy flow at Tracy and/or the CCF.

At present, it is not clear whether the scope of the action and anticipated project impacts will require preparation of an environmental impact statement and environmental impact report (EIS/EIR) instead of an environmental assessment and initial study (EA/IS). However, to ensure the timely and appropriate level of NEPA and CEQA compliance and to limit potential future delays to the project schedule, Reclamation and the DWR are proceeding, at this time, as if the project impacts would require preparation of an EA/IS. Reclamation and the DWR will reevaluate the need for an EIS/EIR after obtaining written and oral comments on the project scope, alternatives and impacts during the scoping process. Reclamation and the DWR will publish a notice of change if, as a result of scoping, a decision is made to prepare an EIS/EIR rather than an EA/IS. However, the scoping process to be conducted will suffice for either course of action.

There are no known Indian Trust Asset or environmental justice issues associated with the proposed action.